



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Goethe's Faust. ed. by Calvin Thomas. Vol. II : The Second Part. D. C. Heath & Co.: Boston, 1897.

PROFESSOR THOMAS' Introduction to his annotated edition of the Second Part of Goethe's *Faust* is characterized by the same keenness of observation, independence of judgment, and practical good sense, that render his edition of the First Part a notable contribution to the study of the poem. Of a total of seventy-one pages, forty-one are devoted to genetic considerations, sixteen to a lucid analysis of the argument of this part of the work, and fourteen to critical observations, suggested by the views of the critics and by Goethe's text.

No one who cares for the poet's art more than for the possible gamut of philosophic theory that may be read into its symbols will find fault with the emphasis attached by the editor to the genesis of the First and Second Parts of Goethe's *Faust*. Studies along this line check vagaries of interpretation that spring from regarding the whole as a sudden, full-blown creation, like Minerva from the brow of Jove, and yield what seems to me an indispensable basis for a full appreciation and enjoyment of the poem as a work of art (cf. Pref. p. i). Equally refreshing is Thomas' conspicuous neglect of the *quam pulchre*, so lavishly furnished by the aesthetically inclined editors of the world's literature. He traces the course by which the Second Part of *Faust* has become what it now is, furnishes the reader with a clear-cut analysis of the same, and treats with impartiality and discrimination the opinions of the critics past and present. While by no means concerned to defend the work against just strictures from whatever source, Thomas reminds himself and us (Pref. p. ii), that 'the initial presumption is always in the great poet's favor.' Silence about elementary matters of Greek and Roman mythology, only scanty citations of conflicting interpretations, and a similar neglect of all but very illuminative parallel passages (cf. *ibidem*) seem to me amply justified by the imperative need of conciseness. I also regard it wise to refer to the *Paralipomena* given in vol. 15 of the Weimar *Goethe*,—a work that should be in the library of every institution, where Goethe's *Faust* is made an object of serious study,—instead of burdening this edition with a bulky apparatus, whose utility would

be obvious to but few. With slight deviations (cf. ll. 9843-50) Thomas' interpretative Notes, pp. 339-457, assume the correctness of the Weimar text, which is followed throughout. Paralipomena and variant readings receive attention only 'where they are clearly and highly important for the understanding of the text in its final form.' In these ways Thomas secures space for a detailed study of the gradual growth of the poem under the influence of the multiplicity of the poet's other tasks and interests and of his painful consciousness of the long gap between the Promethean mood of the seventies and the serener temper of his own old age.

Pages v-xlvi are concerned with this part of the task, and the luminous style of the editor is admirably adapted to presenting concretely the whole process of filling-in and rounding-out in its chronological sequence. The authorities here employed: (1) Goethe's diary, (2) Eckermann's *Gespräche mit Goethe*, (3) Goethe's letters, (4) numerous dated paralipomena (vol. 15 of the *Weimar Goethe*), (5) Düntzer's studies in *Zfdph.* 23.67 ff., and his *Zur Goetheforschung*, pp. 246 ff., and (6) Niejahr's article in *Euphorion* 1. 81 ff. (cf. foot-note, Introd. p. xxi) have been wisely used and with such an adjustment of paraphrase, literal quotation, and combination as adequately to meet the need of the case. It is not my purpose to paraphrase the compact prose of this sketch. Its satisfactory presentation would involve its entire reproduction. For in the whole *Introduction* Thomas sets before us a model of perspicuity and pith. Occasionally I should prefer a slightly different attitude toward the evidence presented. So, for instance, in the consideration of the earliest date for the conception of a bipartite poem (Introd. v, vi, and vii, with foot-notes). I recall the tone of Schiller's letter to Goethe of Sept. 13, 1800, with its allusion to the Second Part, as to a foregone conclusion, and infer from it that the pros and cons for the bipartition had been frequently weighed by the friends in private conversation (cf. Gustav E. Karsten: *Fauststudien*, 1., s. 300-301. *Phil. Studien. Festgabe für Edu. Sievers*. Halle, 1896). In this implication and in the brisk correspondence of the friends concerning the enlarged plan of 1797 (cf. letters of June 22, 23, 24, and 26, 1797), I find warrant for the inference that the idea of the Second Part is referable to the summer

of 1797. Thomas' rejection of E. W. Manning's plea for 1773 on the basis of a paralipomenon published by the latter in the *Goethe-Jahrbuch*, XVII, 209, seems to me well founded upon the abstract thought and vague expression of this outline of the play. The same abstractness and groping uncertainty of expression, when compared with the concrete objectivity of the *Witches' Kitchen* (written in Rome), render very dubious, too, Harnack's argument for 1788 (V.L. 4, 169). In other words, I feel that the evidence for 1797 is stronger than it seems to our editor, although its subjective nature certainly admits of no dogmatizing. Again I am unable to accept Thomas' reflection that 'punishment and penance were alike unavailable in a dramatic action dominated throughout by magic,—. . . were foreign to the tone of the legend,' offered (Introd. p. xxx) to account for the apparent release of the criminal Faust from all consequences of his guilt incurred in the First Part. Certainly remorse and punishment were not foreign to the spirit or letter of the chap-books. No small part of the mental anguish endured by the Faust of the Anonymous proceeds from his despairing attempts under the sneering taunts of Mephistophiles to repent and to turn to God. Not therefore, to my mind, because of the predominance of magic but because (1) of Goethe's own view of Faust's errors as unintentional! stumblings, not willful transgressions of a clearly recognized moral law, and (2) of the impotence of dramatic realism and the necessity of dramatic symbolism for the presentation of character development do we find Faust's punishment treated as an inconspicuous item in the sum total of his life.

Thomas says (Introd. p. xxxiv): 'The paralytic shock, with resulting trance, is indeed, an invention of Goethe,' a statement that should be qualified to match the editor's own note (Notes, p. 377), in which, following Düntzer, he recognizes in Anthony (Antoine) Hamilton's story *L'Enchanteur Faustus* a probable prototype of the magician's becoming the sufferer in case of a rash attempt of a spectator to touch the apparition.

The sub-headings (1) *The Bipartition of the Poem*, (2) *The Helena of 1800*, (3) *The Prose Sketch of 1816*, (4) *The Helena of 1827*, i. e. *The Third Act*, (5) *The First and Second Acts*, (6) *The*

Fourth and Fifth Acts indicate the scope and general sequence of the genetic discussions of pages v–xlvi. These give a clear conspectus of what we know as to the interruptions, alterations, and adaptations involved in the poet's work upon the Second Part.

Pages xlvii–lxii contain a consideration of the more obvious meaning of the whole Second Part. This analysis of the argument is given with such deftness and sense of proportion that the reader finds in it an effective guide to the labyrinth of paths and by-paths, in which the second half of Goethe's *Faust* abounds. Our editor indulges in no wild-goose chase after the elusive 'meaning' of the individual characters of the poem and is concerned in maintaining no thesis as to the 'meaning' of the work as a whole. Acting in accordance with the conviction that Goethe never allegorizes but always proceeds from an observed fact to its philosophy—from a 'pregnant point' (Intro. lxix) to what may be derived from it,—Thomas sees in the 'totality of what happens and not in any pivotal doctrine' (lxxi) the field of interest for the reader seeking enjoyment or instruction. His analysis has to do, therefore, exclusively with the sequence of occurrences and not at all with their problematical 'meaning.' In the rigid application of this objective treatment he is, as far as I know, a pioneer among Faust scholars. While utilizing freely the researches of many other workers past and present (cf. the bibliographical notices in an Appendix at the end of Vol. I of this edition, besides explicit references in both volumes), he preserves everywhere an independence of judgment that leads him to weigh, accept, reject, modify, or supplement, according to his own interpretation of the evidence.

In that part of the Introduction entitled Critical Observations (pp. lxii–lxviii) Thomas' word is brief and to the point. He recalls the unanimity with which the earliest interpreters sought and found in the poem didactic lessons throughout. Proceeding upon the supposition of a fundamental controlling idea, their task centered in discovering the connection between the First and the Second Part and the relation of each to the ground-plan of the whole. Baffled in their attempts to make the obvious meaning of Goethe's words dove-tail into the didactic frame-work created, not by the poet, but by his inter-

preters, the latter ascribed to the former the use of allegorism and of veiled biography. Thus Goethe's poetry, his symbolism, his wit, and his humor were spoiled through well-meant attempts to paraphrase and schematize the whole for the philosophic intellect (Intro. p. lxiii). Hence the later natural conclusion of the critics that the search for the much vaunted oracular wisdom of the poem was a game not worth the candle. Religious and political enemies of the poet heartily concurred in this, so that it finally 'became an accepted dogma of the literary world that the Second Part of *Faust* was a colossal failure' (Intro. p. lxiv), 'labored, incoherent, without plan and without action, and loaded down with an old man's crotchets.' (Cf. Fr. Vischer: *Neue Beiträge*; R. von Raumer: *Vom deutschen Geist*, 1850, p. 167; Gruppe: *Gesch. d. d. Poesie*, 1868, 4. 411; R. Gottschall: *Litteraturgesch.*, 1. 123; Wilh. Gwinner: *Goethe's Faustidee*, etc., 1892; Weitbrecht: *Diesseits von Weimar*, 1895, etc.) Disregarding the habit of Goethe's mind to look at the world concretely and ever to keep in touch with the facts of his personal experience, the wildest theories as to the symbolical import of the poem were proposed. Thus there arose a sort of hare-brained interpretation whose sole claim to consideration was its Quixotic extravagance. In spite of Köstlin's protest (*Goethe's Faust, seine Kritiker und Ausleger*, Tübingen, 1860) against this allegorizing nonsense, in spite of Fr. Vischer's dramatic satire (*Faust, Der dritte Teil in drei Akten von D. S. Allegoriowitsch Mystifizinsky*, 1862), aimed chiefly at the Second Part and secondarily at its philosophical expounders, and in spite of von Loeper's warning (*Faust 1st ed.*, 1870) against the double sin of the critics, (1) in reading into the text particular life experiences of the poet and (2) in mistaking symbolism for allegory, the metaphysical mania has not yet entirely subsided (cf. W. L. Gage: *The Salvation of Faust*, etc., Boston, 1889; Ferd. Aug. Louvier: *Sphinx locuta est*, Berlin, 1887). In view of this the timeliness of Thomas' word concerning the critics is at once obvious. The relief of the public at feeling it no longer necessary to chase philosophical abstractions and fragments of personal history in a game of intellectual hide-and-seek behind the poet's fancies will be due in no slight degree to the clear vision and sane expression of our American editor.

Thomas follows the shift of accent from the Second to the First Part by calling attention to the suggestive studies of Scherer and Fischer, as the starting point of numerous contributions that were greatly stimulated by the discovery in 1887 of the Göchhausen Ms. (Introd., lxv). Schröer's valuable, though rather overlaid commentary upon both parts of the poem, wrought in the spirit of von Loeper, is mentioned approvingly (p. lxvi), as a contribution to the Socratic task of bringing philosophy down from the clouds. The recently opened Weimar Archives, in spite of the trivial nature of much of the material, make it to the mind of our editor 'forever impossible to speak of the Second Part as an afterthought, or even to speak of it as the work of Goethe's old age without duly qualifying the statement.' Former harsh criticism was largely the fruit of misapprehension of Goethe's point of view, and the stylistic senilities, urged so vigorously by critics like Vischer, 'can often be either defended upon philological grounds or paralleled with others equally "bad" from the poet's early writings.' As conducive to a better general understanding of the import of the poem, Thomas mentions (p. lxvi sq.) the efforts of Otto Devrient (Weimar, 1875), of Wilbrandt (Vienna, 1883), and of Possart (Munich, 1894) in adequately staging the drama. Goethe, whose artistic strength lay in vivid intuition, always appeals to the eye as well as to the mind. The final paragraph of this subdivision of the Introduction (p. lxvii), with its admission of blemishes in the Second Part,—prolixity, occasional erudition that is too recondite, here and there a bit of tantalizing symbolism, faults of style and of dramatic construction,—clearly evinces the judicial temper of our editor. We are, however, reminded that these defects are all present in the First Part too, and that, quite aside from 'its didactic interest, it (the Second Part) presents a series of fascinating pictures, matchless in variety of interest and in many-sided suggestiveness. . . . As to the "wisdom," it is at any rate the matured wisdom of Goethe; a man not infallible, a man with his hobbies and vagaries, like other men, but upon the whole the broadest, sanest, and the most helpful among the great critics of modern life.'

Thomas' consideration of the didactic element (p. lxviii-lxxvi) is one of the most suggestive passages in the *Introduc-*

tion. He is certainly right in emphasizing at the outset the intuitive nature of Goethe's genius. The latter's own testimony of 1822 is quoted against all attempts to see in him a metaphysician: 'Certain large *motifs*, legends, ancient traditions, impressed themselves so deeply upon my mind that I kept them alive and effective within me for forty or fifty years. It seemed to me the most beautiful of possessions to see such dear pictures frequently renewed in my imagination as they kept ever transforming themselves, but without changing their character, and ripening toward a clear shape, a more definite representation' (*Bedeutendes Fördernis durch ein einziges geistreiches Wort*, Werke, H. 27, 350) (Intro. p. lxviii). The poet's further statement in the same essay, that he does not rest until he finds a 'pregnant point' from which much can be derived is also quoted, to show the psychological cause of Goethe's symbolism, which always proceeds from the concrete and is, therefore, the opposite of allegory, which proceeds from the abstract (p. lxix). In the effect upon Faust's character of his contact with an ancient Greek ideal of womanly beauty the poet discovered the 'pregnant point' of the legendary Helena incident. Its embodiment became his poetic task, whose 'meaning' admits no succinct statement like the answer to a conundrum. Similarly Goethe looked objectively upon Homunculus, the embryonic *homo* of learned superstition until, in 'an imputed yearning for a corporeal existence,' he discovered in him capacity for a dramatic rôle, as concrete as that of Shakespeare's *Ariel* or *Puck*. Through these illustrations Thomas shows us (p. lxx) the absurdity of attempting to rationalize Goethe's fantastic creations for the logical understanding. 'As well ask what Puck means, or Robin Goodfellow, or Jack-the-Giant-Killer.'

Goethe's protest in a conversation with Eckermann (*Gespräche mit Goethe*, 3, 118, May 6, 1827) against the imputation that he had tried to embody an idea in his Faust and his distinct statement that, speaking broadly, it was never his way as poet to attempt the embodiment of any abstraction is aptly cited by Thomas (p. lxx) against those who like Gwinner (*Goethe's Faustidee*, Frankf. a/m., 1892, p. 14) illustrate the German saying: *Das Ei will klüger sein als die Henne*. This oft-quoted passage is especially valuable as an explicit statement of the

author concerning the poem in question and is entirely in harmony with the spirit of all his other utterances along this line. Gwinner naively opposes to these words of Goethe the latter's statement in a letter of July, 1797, that he had undertaken again the execution of the plan of *Faust*, which was really only an idea (*eine Idee*), apparently without reflecting at all upon the difference between the meanings of the term in the two passages. The word *Idee* conveys such a variety of meaning according to the context, that we only need to ignore the latter to stultify ourselves and to involve almost any German author in an apparently hopeless tangle of contradictions. One of the conspicuous merits of Thomas' editorial work is sharp discrimination in matters of evidence hitherto left murky by the critics.

Without objecting seriously to the term 'secular bible' as applied to *Faust*, Thomas warns us against regarding its various scenes as 'a series of moral texts converging with strenuous logic upon a plan of salvation' (p. lxxi). He once more quotes Goethe appositely (*Über das Lehrgedicht*, Werke, H. 29, 226) to enforce his position: 'All poetry should be instructive, but not noticeably so. It should draw one's attention so that whereof instruction might appear desirable. One should then extract the doctrine for himself, just as from life.' When the angels tell us towards the end of the drama that they can save Faust because he has always 'striven,' we remember that he has striven in our sight for numerous objects of more than doubtful worth. His longing before the magic mirror in the Witches' Kitchen, his efforts to save the realm of the spendthrift ruler by fiat money, his assistance to the weakling Emperor against the usurper, and his efforts to oust from their possessions the harmless old couple, Philemon and Baucis, need a liberal interpretation to save them from a suspicion of baseness. *Streben* is here evidently not the constant and deliberate choice of the higher and nobler of two courses of action. It is the groping of one dominated on the whole by idealism, who is, however, often actuated by lower motives (p. lxxi sq.). We recall the words of the *Prolog: Ein guter Mensch in seinem dunkeln Drange*, etc. Faust leads his life in a large, open-eyed way, stumbles, and even falls, only to rally and push on to new experiences and to renew the struggle

with greater zest. This constant belief in the goodliness and constant relish for the multifarious experiences of life rest upon his fundamental idealism. 'A soul constituted like this is, by the central rightness of things, entitled to a further chance of growth' (cf. *Gespr. mit Goethe* II, 40, Feb. 4, 1829) (Introd. p. lxxii). From this point of view Faust's late conversion to altruism is, not the cause of his salvation, but a fruit of the same rightness of constitution that conditions the latter. Thomas regards as the theme of Faust on its purely ethical side in accordance with the melioristic philosophy of Goethe the 'redemption of a self-tormenting pessimist through an enlarged experience of life culminating in self-forgetful activity.' This seems to me a clear and right conception of the case. But we must also agree with our editor in his strictures upon the way in which this ethical program, clear enough in outline, is wrought out in detail (lxxiv). The 'final conclusion of wisdom' that 'he only deserves freedom and life who is daily compelled to conquer them' is indeed reached *per saltum*. Certainly the magic hocus-pocus at the emperor's court, Faust's infatuation for and fleeting union with Helena, his subsequent struggle for the unworthy monarch, and engineering project for the utilization of his swampy fief are not clear-cut logical steps that lead to the lofty altruistic mood of Faust's death-scene. While mindful, therefore, that we can not rightly demand of Goethe's poem the logical nicety of a philosophical treatise, we remain unsatisfied with the obvious hiatus, and must with Thomas find for this an explanation, though no justification in the poet's gradual change of base. Purposing at the outset to give us a dramatic picture of a life, as suggested by the chap-book, between which and his own the points of similarity were numerous, he naturally conceived the hero as ultimately arriving at such views concerning human betterment, the goodness of life, and the blessedness of devotion to man, as came to the poet after the ebb of his own storm and stress. Then the poetic possibilities of the chap-book data claimed an increasing share of his interest so that he involuntarily yielded to the temptation to desert the ethical point of view (Introd. lxxv-lxxvi).

Following the 337 pages of text are the editor's explanatory

notes, including prefatory words in case of each scene, with references to corresponding parts of the Introduction and with supplementary remarks upon the genesis of the scenes and of their function in the economy of the poem. These Notes (pp. 339-457) deal with real difficulties in the shape of linguistic and metrical peculiarities, somewhat rare historical and mythological allusions, and the organic connection of the successive parts of the drama with the work as a whole. While based, to be sure, in large part, upon the work of Düntzer, Schröer, and other commentators, they reveal through the choice of words and passages for elucidation as well as in numerous original contributions the independent worker, who gauges aright the needs of his public. Schiller's words: *Was er weise verschweigt zeigt mir den Meister des Styls* voice the prime merit of these *Notes*, as of Thomas' editorial work in general.

I can not however agree with our editor in his interpretation of '*des Tages Pforte* (l. 4641) = *the eyelids*—without any mythological allusion, such as Strehlke sees, to the Homeric cloud-gates (*Iliad* 5. 749) which are kept by the Horae.' This seems to me forced and very improbable. Schröer regards *des Tages Pforte* as equivalent to *der Tag* (cf. Schröer's ed. of *Faust* II, Heilbronn, 1888, p. 5). It is certainly not necessary to see with Strehlke any conscious allusion on the part of the poet to the Homeric cloud-gates, even if we insist that *the gate(s) of day* (*des Tages Pforte(n)*) is, in the modern phraseology of the poets, synonymous with *the day* or *the light of day*. Surely to open or to close the *gate of day* refers not to the opening and closing of the eyelids, but to the natural phenomena of dawn and twilight (here, *Dämmerung*). Cf. Milton's *Par. Lost* 6. 2, *Wak'd by the circling hours with rosy hand,*
Unbarred the gates of light; Shakespeare's *Henry VI*, 3. 2. 1:

See how the morning opes her golden gates, etc.; Longfellow's *Saint Gilgen*, Ch. IV:

Day, like a weary pilgrim, had reached the western gates of heaven,
etc.; and Anna L. Barbauld's *A Summer Evening's Meditation*:

*The shadows spread apace, while unkind Eve,
Her cheek yet warm with blushes, slow retires
Through the Hesperian gardens of the West
And shuts the gates of day.*

Equally unsatisfactory is Thomas' explanation of l. 4800, which is practically identical with that of Schröer. Düntzer and the other commentators are silent at this point, as far as I have observed. Thomas says: '*vernichtigen*; supply *will sich*. *Vernichtigen* from *nichtig* means "to make futile" (not the same as *vernichten*, "annihilate"). "Thus all the world is going to pieces and the right (*was sich gebührt*) is becoming an empty form." This seems better than to take *was sich gebührt* as object.' Schröer's comment upon ll. 4799-4800 runs: '*So will sich alle Welt zerstückeln*: so ist alles in Begriff, in Stücke zu zerfallen, sich in gusammenhangslose Atome aufzulösen.—*Vernichtigen* will sich, *was sich gebührt*, was in der Ordnung ist.—*vernichtigen* ist von *nichtig* abgeleitet, also *nichtig* wertlos werden [sic!], nicht vernichten.'

Now Sanders defines *vernichtigen* (*Wörterbuch* 2. 435 b. unten) by referring to *vernichten* and quoting from Brockes, Fischart, Goethe (*Faust II.*, 4800), Herrig, Immermann, Kant, and other passages that show that the feeling for the etymological difference between the two words is, at most, but slight. Thomas and Schröer have apparently been misled by dwelling upon the composition of the word *ver-nichtig-en* into (1) emphasizing unduly the aforesaid difference, (2) into regarding the verb as reflexive, to match what looked like *sich zerstückeln* in the preceding line, and (3) into ignoring the obvious meaning of *alle Welt* = *tout le monde*, not *everything*, but *everybody*. We say in German: *Ich zerpfücke (zerstücke) mir* (dativus ethicus) *alles, was mir in die Hände kommt*.

I construe the lines, therefore, as follows: *So will. sich* (dat.) *alle Welt, was sich gebührt* (acc.), *zerstückeln, vernichtigen* = *Also will jedermann das Ordnungsmässige* (was in der Ordnung ist) *zerstückeln, null und nichtig machen* = 'Thus everybody is bent upon tearing to pieces, upon nullifying the right.' Cf. Bayard Taylor's rendering:

*They all
Pull down what they should care for,—
Destroy their weal in self-despite,*

whose proper grasp of subject and predicate is not entirely obscured by the padding of the verse.

Erspulen is defined by Thomas thus: "earn with the *Spule*" i. e., with the *Webspule* or weaver's spool; "earn by weaving".

Now *spulen* means *Fäden auf die Spulen bringen* = to wind bobbins, to quill, as intermediate step between spinning and weaving (cf. Sanders: *Wörterbuch* 3. 1063, b, oben). It means therefore to fill, not to empty bobbins (*Spulen*), and is used at times synonymously with *spinnen*, not *weben*. Cf. the dialectic expression: *Die Katze sitzt hinterm Ofen und spult (spinnt)*. Hence *erspulen* = to get (earn) by quilling, bobbin-winding,—rather *erspinnen* than *erweben*.

The punctuation of l. 5391, as given by the Weimar ed. and as reproduced by Thomas, with its exclamation point separating the subject *Echo* from its verb *erwidert*, seems to me dictated by an unwarranted *Pietätsgefühl* and not by sound principles of text-criticism. Von Loeper, Düntzer, and Schröer have a comma to cut off the interjection *Horch!* from what precedes, thus avoiding a syntactical dead-lock (cf. my objection to the Weimar punctuation of *Faust I*, l. 719, Mod. Lang. Notes 9. 2. 98 f.) The very questionable policy of the Weimar editors in slavish adherence to even the careless omission of commas, needed to isolate a vocative from its context or a subordinate from a principal sentence, all because in line with the *Ausgabe letzter Hand* (cf. ll. 5521, 5742, 5837, 5911, 5879 etc.), is thrust upon our attention afresh in this edition of Thomas. The word *Windesbraut* (l. 5612) Thomas explains by a reference to his ed. of the First Part, l. 3936: 'a very ancient (O. H. G. *wintes brāt*) and not fully explained name for "tempest," "whirlwind." See Grimm's D. M. 1. 525.' I wish he had called attention to the very convincing argument of B. Schmidt, PBB. 21. 111-24, in which the latter maintains by such parallels as A. S. *sprecan*, *specan*; L. G. *sprütjen*, *spütjen*; Eng. *sprout*, *spout* that *Wind-spraut* (Eng. *spurt*) is literally a *Sprühwind*, a term formed like the Eng. waterspout, with no early mythological history.

Line 6767 tallies so closely with the Chap-book *Faust's* discovery of coal and spooks in place of the treasure sought, that the latter may quite likely be the literary prototype of the former. Lines 4718-20 seem to have been misunderstood by the commentators. I here call attention to Professor Otto Heller's interpretation of this passage in the *Modern Language Notes* for May, which seems to me unquestionably correct.

The typography of the book is in the main excellent. I note the following misprints: p. lxxvi, l. 11, *One* for *On*; p. xxxv, l. 3, 1826 for 1816; p. 62, l. 6079, *Wett* for *Welt*; p. 64, l. 6119, *Paper* for *Papier*; p. 65, l. 6150, *Schatzen* for *Schätzen*; p. 67, l. 6167, *Bieh* for *Vieh*; p. 67, l. 6170, *Fch* for *Ich*; p. 84, l. 6474, *erfricht* for *erfrischt*; p. 91, l. 6604, *Schöpfung* for *Schöpfung*; p. 92, (stage direction,) *erfchallen* for *erschallen*; p. 96, l. 6716, *Bliesz* for *Vliesz*; p. 97, l. 6748, *er* for *es*; p. 108, l. 6975, *foll's* for *soll's*; p. 113, l. 7069, *srisch* for *frisch*; p. 113, l. 7071, *Wär's* for *War's*; p. 118, l. 7175, *Trallern* for *Trällern*; p. 119, l. 7195, *muszt* for *müsz*; p. 125, l. 7329, *Schon* for *Sohn*; p. 136, l. 7584, *Shatz* for *Schatz*; p. 150, l. 7940, *nochzusragen* for *nachzufragen*; p. 191, l. 8851, *Aphindus* for *Aphidnus*; p. 198, l. 8990, *an* for *am*; p. 199, l. 8999, *Eeschlecht* for *Geschlecht*; p. 201, l. 9052, *das* for *dasz*; p. 202, l. 9058, *fo* for *so*; p. 202, l. 9069, superfluous *es*; p. 204, l. 9126, *wir* for *wie*; p. 221, l. 9553, *find* for *sind*; p. 224, l. 9597, *fpürt* for *spürt*; p. 224, l. 9611, *Erdensohn* for *Erdensohn*; p. 229, l. 9717, *maszig* for *mäszig*; p. 247, l. 10098, *sich* for *sie*; p. 250, l. 10160, *Danm* for *Damm*; p. 272, l. 10663, *sine* for *sind*; p. 281, l. 10837, defective type; p. 283, l. 10890, *besten* for *Besten*; p. 284, l. 10907, *bie* for *die*; p. 286, l. 10975, *bamit* for *damit*; p. 290, l. 11044, *ih* for *in*; p. 293, l. 11114, *Digen* for *Dingen*; p. 298, l. 11227, *stelle* for *Stelle*; p. 302, l. 11291, *Gesällt* for *Gefällt*; p. 304, l. 11348, *Gesühl* for *Gefühl*; p. 311, l. 11483, *befreien* for *Befreien*; p. 319, l. 11661, *ans* for *aus*; p. 321, l. 11715, *vör* for *vor*; p. 323, l. 11772, *kämt* for *kommt*; p. 370, l. 33, *Gurtel* for *Gürtel*; p. 379, l. 1, 6647 for 6477; p. 383, l. 8, *Bartigen* for *Bärtigen*; p. 394, l. 8, *Gefällig* for *Gesellig*.

In his edition of the Second Part Thomas has, on the whole, amply redeemed the promise explicitly made in the Preface to his edition of the First Part, 1892. The same absence of verbiage, the same power of seeing clearly the gist of the matter and of effectively presenting the results of independent observation and reflection in the light of present Goethe scholarship that distinguished the First Part dominate throughout the Second.

STARR WILLARD CUTTING.

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO.